THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

W.P.No.1413 of 2006

Date:28.01.2006

G.Kullayappa.

----------Petitioner

The Depot Manager and another.

----------Respondents

ORDER:

The petitioner is employed as a Conductor in APSRTC. He was issued a Charge Sheet, dated 15.02.1995, alleging certain cash and ticket irregularities, and was required to submit explanation as to why necessary disciplinary action shall not be taken against him. The petitioner submitted his explanation on 28.03.1995. On a consideration of the same, the 1st respondent passed an order, dated 07.06.1995, imposing the penalty of stoppage of annual increment for a period of eighteen months and further pdirected that it shall have the cumulative effect on the future increments. The petitioner challenges the same.

The only point urged by Sri Y.Venugopal Reddy, the learned counsel for the petitioner, is that the 1st respondent imposed the penalty of stoppage of annual increment for a period of eighteen months with cumulative effect without conducting departmental enquiry. He placed reliance upon the judgment of the Apex Court in ***KULWANTH SINGH GILL v. STATE OF PUNJAB*** and submits that stoppage of increment is a major penalty and it cannot be imposed, except by conducting departmental enquiry.

Sri P.Vinayaka Swamy, the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents, on the other hand, submits that the penalty imposed against the petitioner itself is minimal, if the lapse on his part is taken into account.

It is a matter of record that the 1st respondent imposed the penalty of stoppage of annual increment for a period of eighteen months with cumulative effect, on the allegation that the petitioner committed certain cash and ticket irregularities. Though a charge sheet was issued to the petitioner before the penalty was imposed, no departmental enquiry was conducted. I n ***KULWANTH SINGH GILL's case*** (supra), the Supreme Court held that stoppage of increments with cumulative effect is a major penalty and it cannot be imposed, except by conducting departmental enquiry.

In the ordinary course of things, the impugned order needs to be set aside, leaving it open to the 1st respondent to pass fresh orders. To avoid further delay and complication in the mater, this Court is of the view that the impugned order can be treated as the one for stoppage of annual increment for a period of eighteen months without cumulative effect.

Hence, the Writ Petition is partly allowed, directing that the order, dated 07.06.1995, passed by the 1st respondent, shall be treated as the one for stoppage of annual increment for a period of eighteen moths without cumulative effect and that the petitioner shall not be entitled for any monetary benefits up to the date of this order. There shall be no order as to costs.

_____

28.01.2006

Jsu